

draft

X

DATE:

AUG 21 1972

To : Jack Lambert
Macquarie University
North Ryde NSW 2113

FROM :

SUBJECT: Yours of 8-16, re my SC Law Rev article

Whatever hybris may be feared to ~~xxxxx~~ be diagnosed by your letter, you will have to take up ~~xxxxx~~ with the gods; if you were concerned about offending me, I have to say that this was a hasty, patch-up job that I would much have preferred to think through more carefully: but it was a special issue of the journal and they had an implacable deadline.

I do enclose two versions of a corrigendum that I have inserted in copies I have sent out, and which may have eloped from yours.

there
and ~~there~~ read immanent) I think I might answer your pocket-sack analogy, first of all by agreeing with you! (See my footnote 5, p. 598; and compare my Nobel-XIV paper; and the last paragraph 611.* But I see I did not really state my own position as clearly as I had intended: certainly, tool-logic cannot validate value-axioms: these are axiomatic. I open myself to profound misinterpretation if this is in doubt).

I also have serious reservations about the reliability of scientific inference in loose ~~xxxxxx~~ systems-- i.e. every humanly important one. At least one should not cloak common sense policy judgments with unwonted scientific rigor.

Lack of center? Yes this does seem the weakest point. I do not offer clearcut ethical prescriptions; and if I did they certainly would not be in any sense scientifically demonstrable. What tool-logic can do, at most, is to test the internal consistency, and to exhibit the probable ramifications, of a given ethical theory. Until I am prepared to work out a constructive ethical theory of man (and my work until now is preeminently critical rather than constructive) I am afraid you will see vortices leading to other dimensions. But the phrase you caught about impossible/unavoidable is just ~~xx~~ sloppy writing. "Impossible" reflected my hopelessness about doing the redefinition of rights really well; "unavoidable" that we had to make some efforts (but we should not expect too much).

Well you may say, I have not touched the real issues at all! Let me turn around and ask you, what is your model of an ~~im~~ ideal world, plausibly obtainable, in which technology is applied for nothing but the common good.

As to your diagram about do vs know, I react that they are indeed totally inextricable. But in law we distinguish between guilty intentions versus actions, and for similar reasons we can factor out large scale action ("technology") as a target of social regulation likely to have fewer distressing side-effects than efforts to control ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ "science".

But we should not expect too much!

Sincerely,

John Lambert